THE LOST GIRL

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
JOHN WORTHEN

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011–4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

British Library cataloguing in publication data

Lawrence, D. H.
The lost girl. – Cambridge ed.
I. Title II. Worthen, John
823'.9'1F PR6023.A93L62 80-40457

ISBN 0 521 22263 X hardback
ISBN 0 521 29423 1 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2001

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1912–16 'Elsa Culverwell'[1] and 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton'

Lawrence finished *Sons and Lovers* in November 1912[2] in Lago di Garda, Italy; he knew even then that he would be starting another novel almost immediately. In the event, he conceived four different novels in the next four months. His plans for the first two, 'Scargill Street' and a Burns novel, were quickly abandoned. The last novel, 'The Sisters', eventually became both *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. The third, 'Elsa Culverwell', seems to have been transmuted into 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton' and then *The Lost Girl* – but only after seven years had passed.[3]

The novel Lawrence planned to start as soon as *Sons and Lovers* was finished was to be called 'Scargill Street'. The way he informed Edward Garnett about it in October 1912 – 'then I start "Scargill Street"'[4] – suggests that Garnett already knew about the project: Lawrence may have been recalling a proposed 'new novel – purely of the common people', which as he had told Garnett in August, he found 'fearfully interesting'[5]. The real-life Scargill Street in Eastwood runs into Victoria Street, where Lawrence was born (see the map on p. xiv). But the novels Lawrence actually started seem to be different again; what will be referred to as the 'Burns Novel'[6] – started after 17 December 1912 – was to be done 'almost like an autobiography'[7] and its first chapter was set in the woods and country near Eastwood. This piece probably got no further than the thirteen-page manuscript which survives, and it seems to have been abandoned shortly after Christmas 1912.

On the other hand, the story to be referred to as 'Elsa Culverwell' – and its successors, 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton'[8] and *The Lost Girl* – though set in Eastwood, concentrated on a family a very long way from 'the

[1] This title will be used throughout for the MS (Roberts–Vasey E209b) described in Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 44–6 as 'My mother made a failure...' It is printed as an appendix.

[2] *Letters*, i. 476.

[3] As was customary DHL found it difficult to settle on a satisfactory title and used a variety of names for the work which was finally to be called *The Lost Girl*: 'Elsa Culverwell', 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton', 'Mixed Marriage' and 'The Bitter Cherry'.

[4] *Letters*, i. 466.

[5] Ibid. 431.

[6] MS (Roberts–Vasey E59.3) in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas [hereafter – UT], and printed in Nehls, i. 184–95.

[7] *Letters*, i. 487.

[8] Ibid. 546.

common people'. Even while writing the 'Burns Novel', Lawrence was thinking of this new work; he told Sallie Hopkin on 23 December 1912 that 'I shall do a novel about Love Triumphant one day. I shall do my work for women, better than the suffrage.'[9] That may have been his starting-point for the work he probably did next, the twenty-page fragment 'Elsa Culverwell'. This first-person narrative of a girl describing her family and her girlhood breaks off in mid-paragraph, which suggests that it is the whole of an unfinished draft, and not merely the surviving bit of a longer work. It may have been what Lawrence was describing when he wrote to Garnett at the end of December 1912: 'I've stewed my next novel inside me for a week or so, and have begun dishing it up. It's going to have a bit of a plot, and I don't think it'll be unwieldy, because it'll be further off from me and won't come down on my head so often. (A bit mixed in the metaphor.)'[10] This is unlikely to refer to the 'Burns Novel', which Lawrence was writing on 24 December. Since the latter only runs to thirteen pages, it would be odd if he were still 'dishing it up' five days later. And the 'Burns Novel', written 'almost like an autobiography', could hardly be described as 'further off from me'. It is also unlikely to refer to 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton', which Lawrence was secretive about a fortnight later ('a new work that I shall not tell you about, because it may not come off'[11]). Having abandoned the 'Burns Novel' after Christmas, and probably written the nineteen pages of 'Elsa Culverwell' at the end of December, Lawrence then must have realised the potential in the latter story and rethought it as 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton', about which he was excited and mysterious.

'Elsa Culverwell' concerns the Culverwell family who were to figure prominently in *The Lost Girl* as the Houghtons, and who had first appeared as the Staynes family in the first surviving draft of *Sons and Lovers* called 'Paul Morel'.[12] Miriam in that draft is a daughter of the Staynes family, and Paul visits the house on a number of occasions for music lessons from her governess Miss May. Mr Staynes 'had inherited from his father a large grocery business' but had felt 'superior to retail business', with the result that his 'prosperity had dribbled away'.[13] His situation, and that of his household, are reproduced down to the smallest details in 'Elsa Culverwell', and again in *The Lost Girl*. Mr Staynes, Frederick Culverwell and James Houghton are all would-be genteel, ineffectual, flighty men, in trade, who

[9] Ibid. 490.
[10] Ibid. 496–7.
[11] Ibid. 501.
[12] Unpublished MS (Roberts–Vasey E373d) in UT. Staynes was a family name familiar to DHL: see *Letters*, i. 22 n.1.
[13] 'Paul Morel' MS, p. 148.

marry older women with money, and acquire large houses over shops in Eberwich, Bestwood and Woodhouse respectively. They fail in business, devote themselves to fanciful and unsuccessful projects, and vanish to their clubs to escape their families and themselves. Their wives are of the superior invalid type; the governesses they employ for their daughters are bespectacled and white-haired (though only thirty) and eventually work as itinerant piano teachers. All three families have identical, softly-spoken supervisors of their work-girls. In 'Paul Morel', the family has a daughter away from home as well as their daughter Miriam; in 'Elsa Culverwell', the elder of the daughters lives away from home. (In *The Lost Girl*, Alvina is the only daughter.) The parallels are innumerable, and we can assume the same family appeared in 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton'.

The reason for the similarities is that all three households are based on the Cullen family of Eastwood, which Lawrence knew as boy and adolescent. George Henry Cullen whose failures (and projects) became legendary, his invalid wife, his governess Miss Wright, his work-girl supervisor Miss Pidsley, his substantial house in Nottingham Road, and his daughter Florence, who like Alvina in *The Lost Girl* became a nurse, obviously fascinated Lawrence. Having first recreated them in 1911 for 'Paul Morel' – and dropped them from the novel when he put Miriam back in the family to which in real life she belonged – he re-invented and re-named them for 'Elsa Culverwell'; then he probably recreated them again for 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton' in 1913, as he did yet again for *The Lost Girl* in 1920.

There are other less obvious but nonetheless significant links between the different versions. In 'Elsa Culverwell', where he called the governess 'Miss Niell', Lawrence once wrote 'Miss Revell' and then corrected his mistake:[14] 'Revell' is the governess's married name in 'Paul Morel'. Furthermore, the Staynes' elder daughter in 'Paul Morel' is Lucy, aged fifteen, who 'is away, living with a well-to-do aunt';[15] the Culverwells' elder daughter is also named Lucy (the name of the real-life Mr Cullen's wife), and she goes to boarding-school until her death at the age of sixteen. The town in 'Elsa Culverwell' is called Bestwood, and Lawrence renamed Eberwich Bestwood in *Sons and Lovers*. These three links suggest a natural affinity between the 'Paul Morel' version and 'Elsa Culverwell'.[16] Having decided to cut the Staynes material from his revised 'Paul Morel', Lawrence probably thought of using it as the basis for a new novel; thus, 'Elsa Culverwell' is a bridge

[14] Appendix, 348: 18.

[15] 'Paul Morel' MS, pp. 148–9.

[16] There is a pencil note on the back of the tenth leaf of 'Elsa Culverwell' saying 'Sons and Lovers'.

between *Sons and Lovers* and 'The Insurrection', between the material Lawrence brought directly from his own youthful experience and the 'work for women' he promised to Sallie Hopkin, which culminated in *The Rainbow* and in *Women in Love*. 'Elsa Culverwell' and the first draft of 'The Sisters' also share the characteristic of first person narration by a woman, which Lawrence only used once again many years later.[17] While 'Elsa Culverwell' looks back to *Sons and Lovers*, it looks forward to 'The Sisters' and all that followed. Because of the importance of 'Elsa Culverwell' in the history of Lawrence's development as a novelist, and because none of 'The Insurrection' survives, this fragment is reproduced in full in the Appendix.

But, clearly, 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton' took hold of Lawrence's imagination early in 1913. He told Garnett in January how 'the thought of it fills me with a curious pleasure – venomous, almost. I want to get it off my chest.'[18] Since the manuscript has vanished, we can only speculate about this version, but it sounds more satirical than its predecessor. Frieda Lawrence found it 'witty' when she read it in May.[19] Its view of social England (and presumably of its recreated Eastwood) was obviously very different from that of *Sons and Lovers*.

Lawrence wrote it quite fast; by 17 January, he had done eighty pages of it. But the new book was turning out to be 'a most curious work, which gives me great joy to write, but which, I am afraid, will give most folk extreme annoyance to read; if it doesn't bore them.'[20] Practically all that is known about it for certain is that its heroine's name was 'Anna'.[21] We may think of Bennett's *Anna of the Five Towns*, which Lawrence had been reading in October 1912;[22] also of the Anna who would become so important in *The Rainbow* in the following year. The novel interested him enormously; a fortnight later, he told Garnett:

I have done 100 pages of a novel. I think you will hate it, but I think, when it is re-written, it might find a good public amongst the Meredithy public. It is quite different in manner from my other stuff – far less visualised. It is what I *can* write just now, and write with pleasure, so write it I must, however you may grumble. And it is good too. I think, do you know, I have inside me a sort of answer to the *want* of today: to the real, deep want of the English people, not to just what they

[17] In the MS (Roberts–Vasey E167) of an unpublished story described in Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 73–4 as 'If you are a woman, and if ever you can pray...' and now in the Library of the University of California at Berkeley. Written c. 1924, the fragment is a woman's reminiscence of falling in love with an Italian; but it appears to bear no relationship to *The Lost Girl*.

[18] *Letters*, i. 501.

[19] Ibid. 549.

[20] Ibid. 505.

[21] Ibid. 546. The name is deleted in DHL's reference to the novel in this letter.

[22] Ibid. 459.

fancy they want. And gradually, I shall get my hold on them. And this novel is perhaps not such good art, but it is what they want, need, more or less. But I needn't talk about it, when only 106 pages are written.[23]

This sense of his role as a novelist is something new, and marks the nature of the advance to *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* which he achieved this spring. The 'Meredithy public' would, of course, appreciate the erotic, and this novel was to become steadily more and more forthright. In mid-February it was still going 'quite fast': 'It is awfully exciting, thrilling, to my mind – a bit outspoken, perhaps. I shall write it as long as I like to start with, then write it smaller. I must always write my books twice.'[24] By the beginning of March it was 'half written' and 'a weird thing. I rather love it.'[25] During March, however, doubts about it began to creep into Lawrence's mind; not of its quality, but of the kind of novel it was, and whether he should at that date be writing it.

Sons and Lovers was still not published, and though Garnett and Duckworth were enthusiastic about it, neither they nor Lawrence knew whether it would be a success. Lawrence had always been anxious about its sexual explicitness, and remarked at the start of March that he didn't mind 'if Duckworth crosses out a hundred shady pages in *Sons and Lovers*. It's got to sell, I've got to live'.[26] He had published little since *The Trespasser* the previous May: only a couple of poems, two pieces of prose, and his first volume of poetry, *Love Poems*. The latter had come out in February 1913, and Lawrence was disappointed by its muted reception. At the same time, he was concerned about money; 'I am coming to the end of my cash', he wrote on 3 March[27] and a week later asked Duckworth for a £50 advance on *Sons and Lovers*. With his various worries, it was hardly the moment to be busy with a long and increasingly unpublishable book. Lawrence wrote to Garnett on 11 March:

I am a damned curse unto myself. I've written rather more than half of a most fascinating (to me) novel. But nobody will ever dare to publish it. I feel I could knock my head against the wall. Yet I love and adore this new book. It's all crude as yet, like one of Tony's clumsy prehistorical beasts – most cumbersome and floundering – but I think it's great – so new, so really a stratum deeper than I think anybody has

[23] Ibid. 511.

[24] Ibid. 517.

[25] Ibid. 525.

[26] Ibid. 526. William Heinemann had rejected *Sons and Lovers* in the summer of 1912 because it was 'one of the dirtiest books he had ever read' (*Phoenix* 233); see also *Letters*, i. 421 n. 4. There are several expurgations in the text of the Duckworth first edition which appear to have been made neither by DHL in proof-revision nor by Edward Garnett in his original cutting of the MS. See DHL, *Sons and Lovers, A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, ed. Mark Schorer (Berkeley, 1977), pp. 4–5.

[27] *Letters*, i. 522.

ever gone, in a novel. But there, you see, it's my latest. It is all analytical – quite unlike *Sons and Lovers*, not a bit visualised. But nobody will publish it. I wish I had never been born. But I'm going to stick at it, get it done, and then write another, shorter, absolutely impeccable – as far as morals go – novel. It is an oath I have vowed – if I have to grind my teeth to stumps, I'll do it – or else what am I going to live on, and keep Frieda on withal.[28]

But within ten days Lawrence was, after all, at work on that 'shorter, absolutely impeccable' novel; 'The Insurrection' had proved '*too* improper'.[29] Compared with this slighter novel, 'The Insurrection' was '1000 times "more", but improper!'[30] Lawrence started work on what he called his 'pot-boiler' with the firm intention of going back to 'The Insurrection' as soon as he could afford to. But the 'pot-boiler' turned into 'The Sisters', which he wrote and reworked until 1919 as *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. Although, he remarked, 'The Insurrection' 'has my love', it would 'be none the worse for waiting a while'.[31]

It had to wait for seven years. The manuscript was left in Bavaria with the manuscripts of *Sons and Lovers* and of the 'Burns Novel' when the Lawrences stayed there in May and June 1913. The next time Lawrence thought of it was apparently in 1916, after he had gone to Cornwall. *The Rainbow* had been banned in November 1915, and although he still had on his hands the rest of the material from the 'Sisters' project (which he was shortly to develop into *Women in Love*), he first seems to have made an attempt to get back 'The Insurrection' manuscript. He wrote to Lady Ottoline Morrell in mid-March 1916:

I am writing nothing just at present. I shall begin when we are settled in our cottage, but I am not quite sure what I shall do. If I can get a manuscript from Germany, I shall go on with that. It is a novel I began three years ago. I should like to go on with it now.[32]

It is possible that he was thinking of the 'Burns Novel' – also left in Germany, also started three years before. But as the situation was repeated exactly in the winter of 1919–20, when Lawrence again wrote to Germany for the manuscript of a novel and this time it certainly *was* 'The Insurrection' which he wanted; and as we know that he had always planned to go back to 'The Insurrection', then we may be certain that the novel he wanted in 1916 was the same. He may have thought that working on it would be a relief from the pain inevitable in a continuation of Ursula's history; he may also have reckoned that, after *The Rainbow*, it mattered no longer how *risqué* his

[28] Ibid. 526.
[29] Ibid. 536.
[30] Ibid. 549.
[31] Ibid. 530.
[32] Letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 15 March 1916.

material was, because he could not expect it to be published. At all events, he waited more than a month for it. 'Soon I shall begin to work', he told Catherine Carswell in mid-April, 'I am waiting for a novel manuscript to come from Germany.'[33] But clearly the War was preventing the manuscript from being sent to him, and within ten days of that letter he was at work on *Women in Love* instead.

1919–20 The Lost Girl

The post defeated him in 1916; it nearly defeated him again in 1919–20. Having left England in November 1919 with almost no money, *The Rainbow* still out of print in Britain and *Women in Love* still unpublished, and little or no demand for his work, it was natural for Lawrence to think of applying himself to a project which would make him some money quickly. And 'The Insurrection' was a half-completed novel for which he had a peculiar affection. His first reference to it after the War comes in a letter to his American publisher B. W. Huebsch in December 1919; Lawrence wrote to him that when *Women in Love* was published 'I shall have another novel ready – not before – a more possibly popular one.'[34] This was the bait for Huebsch, who had not finally committed himself to publication of *Women in Love*. Lawrence had passed through Lerici in North Italy, on his way to Florence (where he wrote to Huebsch); this was the place 'where we used to live'[35] and where he had written 'The Sisters' before the war; it may have reminded him of that other novel, written in Italy and never finished. Frieda Lawrence was returning from Baden-Baden on the day he wrote to Huebsch, and it is possible that Lawrence had asked her to try to recover the manuscript when she visited her sister in Munich. But her journey turned out to be 'a nightmare of muddle' in a country still disorganised by war;[36] she probably did not go to Munich, and she certainly failed to bring back the manuscript. Once more Lawrence had to wait for it to come by post.

Just before Christmas 1919, he and Frieda set out on the next stage of their journey south; they went to Picinisco, south of Rome; and though Lawrence found the place cold and disagreeable, it provided him with a final locale for his unfinished novel.[37]

After retreating to Capri (where they stayed near Compton Mackenzie)

[33] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 16 April 1916.
[34] Letter to B. W. Huebsch, 3 December 1919.
[35] Postcard to Cecily Lambert, 18 November 1919.
[36] Frieda Lawrence, '*Not I, But the Wind*...' (1935), p. 91.
[37] See letters to Rosalind Baynes, 16 December 1919; to Irene Whittley, 18 December 1919; to Catherine Carswell, 4 January 1920; to Sallie and William Hopkin, 9 January 1920.

Lawrence told his English publisher Martin Secker about his new plans for a novel. Secker, too, was considering publishing *Women in Love*. The new book Lawrence told him about was 'a novel three parts done, "Mixed Marriage," which I left in Germany before the war. This would make a perfect selling novel when I've finished it.'[38] On the face of it, that was an odd thing to say about 'The Insurrection' (now with the interim title 'Mixed Marriage'), which had been abandoned because it was unpublishable. It is unlikely that Lawrence had forgotten that; clearly he was trying to reassure Secker, as he had tried to reassure Huebsch, that he was capable of producing work which would sell, and would be an insurance against the risks involved in publishing *Women in Love*. Secker wanted to be Lawrence's publisher, but was worried about a repetition of the *Rainbow* fiasco. As late as April 1920 he was still saying that he felt 'instinctively that anything to do with D.H.L. is rather dangerous', and that Lawrence must be 'as unprovocative as possible'.[39] Lawrence knew how his publishers regarded him, and was designing his next novel to reassure them. It was the novel's difference from *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* which he stressed when he wrote to Secker again in January 1920. The manuscript had still not arrived.

> It is a novel, two-thirds finished – quite unlike my usual style – more eventual – I am very keen to see it. I thought if I finished it, it would be quite *unexceptionable*, as far as the Censor is concerned, and you might publish it soon after *The Rainbow*, if you liked – or leave it till *Women in Love* is also done.[40]

Lawrence was clearly trying to use 'The Insurrection' as a bargaining point in his negotiations over *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*; and he was prepared to take less money for the risky books, if he could recoup on the new one. Compton Mackenzie, one of Secker's successful authors, was advising Lawrence, and 'suggested £200 for *The Rainbow*, £300 for *Women in Love*, and £500 for the book I am expecting – it is in the post now'.[41] However, before the manuscript arrived, Lawrence had broken off the arrangement with Secker over the two other books, and was trying to negotiate with his old publisher Duckworth. It is unclear what negotiations with Duckworth had been carried on, but Lawrence thought him 'a bit timid. I wish he could be reassured some way or other.'[42] It is a fair assumption that he, too, had been wooed with the idea of the 'perfect selling novel'.

[38] Letter to Martin Secker, 27 December 1919.
[39] Letter from Secker to Compton Mackenzie, 12? April 1920, in Mackenzie, *Octave Five* (1966), p. 172.
[40] Letter to Secker, 16 January 1920.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 5 February 1920.

These letters show that Lawrence's main aim was to get his earlier books published.[43] He clearly felt he could complete 'The Insurrection' both quickly and safely; and he very much needed an income from his writing, after the lean years of the war.

The post to Capri was extremely bad in the early months of 1920; it denied Lawrence his Christmas parcels until the spring, and it was not until February that Lawrence's diary records the manuscript's arrival from Germany.[44] Lawrence immediately started work on it; it was obviously still part of his plans to complete it. 'MS – began novel' appears in his diary for 12 February.[45]

It is not, however, absolutely certain what he actually did with the manuscript. He told Amy Lowell that 'I have just begun a new novel',[46] and Catherine Carswell also heard that 'I've started a novel'.[47] Both remarks imply that he was not writing a continuation to an unfinished book, but actually starting again, using the manuscript as a basis. That would be consistent with his usual habits of composition; as he told Koteliansky the previous year, 'I loathe returning to my vomit: going back to old work.'[48] It seems probable that in Capri he started writing a novel, later referred to as the 'Capri Novel', on the old material; and, to begin with, he was pleased with its progress, telling Robert Mountsier, 'I am busy with a novel now – rather nice – goes quite well.'[49] Progress during February was slow, impeded by visits to Montecassino and Sicily, and the move to the Fontana Vecchia in Taormina. Not until 9 March was he in a position to start work again. That day he told Koteliansky how 'I want to work – I mean I ought to. Perhaps I shall, here, it is so still, and festooned with flowers, beautiful.'[50] That suggests that he was not happy with the work he had done in Capri before moving. The same day, he wrote to the American publisher who was now handling the publication of *Women in Love*, Thomas Seltzer (Huebsch had dropped out during confused negotiations during the winter): 'I'm glad you like *Touch and Go* – and your wife likes the *Rainbow* – son' contento. *Women in Love* is best, next to *The Rainbow*. I am doing Mixed Marriage – it should be more popular – one withdraws awhile from battle.'[51] It is not clear

[43] It is significant that he wanted to use 'The Insurrection' for his bargaining rather than the still unfinished *Aaron's Rod*, which he had been working at fitfully for the past two years.
[44] Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 89.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Letter to Amy Lowell, 13 February 1920.
[47] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 22 February 1920.
[48] Letter to S. S. Koteliansky, 17 January 1919.
[49] Letter to Robert Mountsier, 16 February 1920.
[50] Letter to Koteliansky, 9 March 1920.
[51] Letter to Thomas Seltzer, 9 March 1920.

from this letter whether Lawrence was actually working on 'Mixed Marriage' as he now called 'The Insurrection' on 9 March, or whether it was simply his current work-in-progress; the letter to Koteliansky sounds as if he had not actually started. But two days later he wrote again to Koteliansky that 'I am more or less busy on a new novel',[52] and Rosalind Baynes heard on 15 March that 'I've begun to try to work – begun a novel.'[53] That is an odd thing to say about a novel apparently started over a month earlier, but the mystery is explained by a letter to Mackenzie of 22 March: 'I scrapped all the novel I did in Capri – have begun again – got about 30,000 words, I believe, done since I'm here.'[54] 'Since I'm here' must mean 'since I came to Taormina'. Between 22 and 31 March, Lawrence wrote (by his own calculation) another 20,000 words of the book;[55] if he had been writing the whole of the novel at the same rate, he would have started it about 13 days before 22 March, that is, around 9 March, which exactly fits the date given above. Indeed it appears likely that he did no more work on the 'Capri Novel': what he wrote in Taormina constituted a new start. And what he wrote in Taormina was *The Lost Girl*. Since not a single page of 'The Insurrection' manuscript appears in the manuscript of *The Lost Girl* (which is a continuous composition on two kinds of paper throughout), it is clear that Lawrence had also abandoned any attempts simply to write a continuation of the old novel – if, indeed, he had ever tried to do so. Probably Lawrence originally worked with the newly arrived manuscript of 'The Insurrection' beside him, in a brief attempt to write a new version of it; and working in Taormina a month later, he began again: only this time the novel was allowed to grow to full length. Moreover, it is perhaps unlikely that *The Lost Girl* owed very much to 'The Insurrection' beyond its central situation (which was, in any case, from real life), the outline of its plot ('Mixed Marriage'), some specific details and its starting point in 1913.

The Lost Girl, as it can now safely be called, was written quite fast, in almost exactly eight weeks, from about 9 March to 5 May 1920. Despite Lawrence's misgivings – 'don't know if it will ever end'[56] and 'I may come to a full stop any minute'[57] – it seems to have been written at an almost constant speed; after just over four weeks of work, he had written 245 pages out of a final total of 415. It was natural that he should be worried about not finishing it; *Aaron's Rod* had been on his hands since the spring of 1918.

[52] Letter to Koteliansky, 11 March 1920.
[53] Letter to Rosalind Baynes, 15 March 1920.
[54] Letter to Mackenzie, 22 March 1920.
[55] Letter to Jessica Brett Young, 31 March 1920.
[56] Letter to Rosalind Baynes, 15 March 1920.
[57] Letter to Mackenzie, 22 March 1920.

But a significant difference was that, in 1920, he had publishers on both sides of the Atlantic considering his work, and eager for a novel which would not run the risks of *The Rainbow* or *Women in Love*. *The Lost Girl* seems to have been, from the start, a novel written for commercial publication, and consciously different from those earlier books. Lawrence wrote with some bravado to Compton Mackenzie on 22 March, with almost a quarter of *The Lost Girl* written: 'Damn the world, why is one such a fool as to offer it anything serious *di cuore*. I've finished forever – wish I'd never begun. Henceforth my fingers to my nose – and my heart far off.'[58] It is not wise to take such an outburst literally, but it suggests the direction of Lawrence's thinking: *The Lost Girl* was not 'serious *di cuore*' but *amusing*. His letters stressed this point: 'meant to be comic – but not satire'.[59]

It went well: he was 'three quarters through a quite amusing novel'[60] on 11 April, and he wrote about it as he always did of such novels; as if it possessed an independent life: 'a rather comic novel, which runs out of my control and jumps through the port-hole into the unknown ocean, and leaves me on deck painfully imploring it to come home'.[61] But he was also aware of a public just over his shoulder: 'I am going to give it to Mary [Cannan] to criticise. I feel that as she sits in her room in Timeo she will represent the public as near as I want it. So like an "aristo" before Robespierre, I shake in my superior shoes.'[62] (Mary Cannan, an old friend of the Lawrences from before the War, and onetime wife of the novelist Gilbert Cannan, was staying in a local hotel.) He never lost that sense of its commercial potential. He wrote to Koteliansky at the start of April that 'I have done half of my new novel – quite amusing. But I shan't say anything to Secker yet, I shall probably sell it to the highest bidder when it is finished. It is as proper as proper need be.'[63] Negotiations with Duckworth had come to nothing, and he had gone back to Secker as his publisher for *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. Secker had an option on the next four books: 'I do this because I want *The R*, and *W. in L* published, and no one else will do them.'[64] Lawrence wanted to get *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* into print, but he was not particularly happy with the idea of Secker's publishing *The Lost Girl*. When he wrote to Secker in early April he was clearly trying to evade the terms of his contract: 'I have done more than half of my new novel – think it is amusing, and might be quite popular. Hope to have it done before the

[58] Ibid.
[59] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 31 March 1920.
[60] Letter to Mountsier, 11 April 1920.
[61] Letter to Jessica Brett Young, 31 March 1920.
[62] Letter to J. Ellingham Brooks, 31 March 1920.
[63] Letter to Koteliansky, 5 April 1920.
[64] Letter to Mountsier, 7 June 1920.

end of May. – What about it? Do you want to saddle yourself with it, having already the other two books, or shall I go to a commercial firm?'[65] But Secker was, not surprisingly, eager to consider it. *The Lost Girl* could perhaps help Lawrence get the 'dangerous' books published because it was a different *kind* of book. Henceforth there was no doubt that Secker would be its English publisher.

Apart from a trip to Syracuse from 25 to 27 April, which left its traces in the novel at the start of chapter XII,[66] Lawrence seems to have stayed in Taormina the rest of the month, and to have worked steadily at the book. Secker heard from him when only the last five chapters, at most, remained to be written:

> I hope to finish my novel next week. It is called 'The Lost Girl' – or maybe 'The Bitter Cherry'. Probably I will send it to you to be typed. But the post here is howling insecurity. I may get it typed in Rome... It is I think an amusing book, and I don't think it is at all improper: quite fit for Mudies. I wish it could be serialised. Do you think there is any possibility? But you must see the MS.[67]

He repeated his belief that the novel was not improper in at least five other letters, but just as often he stressed its potential as a money-maker: 'Let's hope my Lost Girl will be Treasure Trove to me.'[68] His reference to Mudies suggests that in April Secker must have written that the novel sounded suitable for selling to the large circulating libraries; that contributed to Lawrence's growing belief in its financial potential. *The Lost Girl* must have struck Secker as exactly the kind of title which might lead to trouble; Lawrence was even prepared to agree to Secker's preference for 'The Bitter Cherry' as a title, and may have suggested it in the first place to quieten his fears. Lawrence continued to be irritated by his publisher's timidity: 'There should be a committee for his moral encouragement.'[69] But he was also prepared to compromise, particularly as Secker (after much heart-searching) had reluctantly accepted the title *Women in Love*: 'My *Lost Girl* amused me so, such a film title. But we shall have to let Secker have this, as he yields me *Women in Love*.'[70] Lawrence continued to stress the

[65] Letter to Secker, 9 April 1920.

[66] See, for instance, DHL's description of Mrs Tuke: 'Very like a head on one of the lovely Syracusan coins', with a look of the old Sicilian women 'who laughed above the latomia' (see explanatory note on p. 274: 20). Since the reference to the Latomia is part of the continuous writing in the MS we can be fairly certain that DHL did not write this passage before the last week of April 1920, when he had returned from Syracuse to Taormina.

[67] Letter to Secker, 29 April 1920.

[68] Letter to Lady Cynthia Asquith, 7 May 1920.

[69] Letter to Thomas Moult, 6 May 1920.

[70] Letter to Mackenzie, 16 May 1920.

commercial value of the original title: 'Everybody cries out that *The Lost Girl* is so much better title than 'Bitter Cherry'. More selling, I'm sure';[71] in the end Secker allowed himself to be persuaded.

Lawrence wrote to Compton Mackenzie what he really thought about the novel. While other people heard only that *The Lost Girl* was amusing, 'not morally lost, poor darling',[72] and 'quite passable, from Mudies point of view',[73] Lawrence told Mackenzie just after finishing the book that he was 'terrified of my Alvina, who marries a Cicio'. He had just read Mackenzie's recent novel *The Adventures of Sylvia Scarlett*,[74] and compared Alvina to Sylvia:

> I believe neither of us has found a way out of the labyrinth. How we hang on to the marriage clue! Doubt if its really a way out. – But my Alvina, in whom the questing soul is lodged, moves towards reunion with the dark half of humanity. Whither your Sylvia? the ideal? I loathe the ideal with an increasing volume of detestation – *all* ideal.
>
> ...But after my novel I am holidaying for one month. Then I should like to start again, with another I have in mind. I feel as if I was victualling my ship, with these damned books. But also, somewhere they are the crumpled wings of my soul. They get me free before I get myself free. I mean in my novel I get some sort of wings loose, before I get my feet out of Europe.[75]

And when he got the novel back from the typist in early June, he wrote to Mackenzie:

> It's different from all my other work: not immediate, not intimate – except the last bit: all set across a distance. It just came like that. May seem dull to some people – I can't judge.[76]

However, the most important thing in the early summer of 1920 to Lawrence was the opportunity which *The Lost Girl* seemed to offer of making money; it could perhaps be serialised as well as published as a book. Conversation and correspondence with Mackenzie, and perhaps with the Brett Youngs, may have encouraged him, and it did seem particularly appropriate for *The Lost Girl*, because it was different from his previous

[71] Letter to Secker, 31 May 1920.
[72] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 12 May 1920.
[73] Letter to Lady Cynthia Asquith, 7 May 1920.
[74] I.e. *The Early Life and Adventures of Sylvia Scarlett* (1918), and *Sylvia and Michael* (1919), published separately but written as a single novel, and later published complete as *The Adventures of Sylvia Scarlett* (1950). Like Alvina Houghton Sylvia Scarlett goes away with actors on tour (a musical comedy company): book 1, chap. 7.
[75] Letter to Mackenzie, 10 May 1920.
[76] Letter to Mackenzie, 11 June 1920.

work.[77] Lawrence had no professional agent; Robert Mountsier, a journalist and personal friend who was acting for him in America, was inexperienced, and Lawrence had broken with his English agent J. B. Pinker in December 1919. He was now handling his publishing arrangements himself, with the advice of men like Mackenzie and Secker. When appealed to, Secker wrote that he had a connection with the American magazine *The Century*, and would see if he could help. After this encouragement, Lawrence's letters refer to the idea frequently, and he began to wonder if he could get the book serialised in England as well: 'It would be a safeguard against prosecutions, and it would bring me some money. I think I shall try.'[78] For two months he had been insisting that the novel was 'as proper as need be',[79] and the idea that serialisation might be a safeguard against prosecution is somewhat odd. It suggests Lawrence's continuing distrust of his reading public, because of his difficulties with *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, and it was his excuse for a straight commercial venture: 'I wish I could get it serialised – in England too. One *must* make some money these days; or perish.'[80] The idea of serialisation had serious consequences for the way the text has come down to us.

Lawrence finished the novel exactly when he had predicted, in the first week of May.[81] His problem then was to get it typed and into the hands of his publishers, with a copy he could use in his efforts to get it serialised. With no agent in England to arrange for typing, and in addition, feeling 'a bit scared of putting this sole MS into the Italian post',[82] Lawrence decided on a typist in Rome someone had recommended to him.[83] The first batch

[77] The idea was to stay with him into 1921 when he tried to get both *Mr Noon* and *Sea and Sardinia* serialised (letter to Curtis Brown, 4 April 1921); though even Curtis Brown, by then his agent, could only manage to get two heavily cut sections of the latter in the *Dial*, 71 (October 1921), 441–51 and 71 (November 1921), 583–92.

[78] Letter to Secker, 31 May 1920.

[79] Letter to Koteliansky, 5 April 1920.

[80] Letter to Secker, 12 June 1920.

[81] Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 90.

[82] Letter to Secker, 9 April 1920.

[83] The typist was a Miss Wallace, of Pension White, 11 Via Vittoria Colonna, Rome. Pension White still exists, but it has not been possible to identify her further, except to point out that a 'Miss Wallace' had a house in Taormina (letter to Mary Cannan, 12 December 1920). DHL at first thought she was charging him a shilling per 1,000 words (though he wrote '100' in a letter to Francis Brett Young, 6 May 1920); with a MS of approximately 135,000 words, that would have meant a bill of £6 15*s* 0*d*. But later DHL came to expect a bill of '*at least* 1000 Lire – I can't bear to talk of it' (letter to Jan Juta, 29 May 1920), which with the exchange rate at 80 meant a bill of £12 10*s* 0*d*. When the bill finally came, 'That bitch charged me exactly 1348 Lire: which is exorbitant, even for a London expert, which she isn't' (letter to Jan Juta, 13 June 1920); Miss Wallace was charging him at the rate of 10 *lire* (or 2*s* 6*d*) per 1,000 words, which meant a bill equivalent to £16 17*s* 0*d*.

of manuscript went to her on 5 May 1920,[84] and as soon as he heard that it had arrived safely, the second batch followed.

While the book was being typed, Lawrence conceived the plan that friends might take copies of the book to America and England for him as a safeguard against the dangers of the post. His first idea, that Robert Mountsier should come to Taormina to pick up the American copy, could not be managed;[85] he arranged instead for his landlord Francesco Cacopardo, who was travelling to Boston in June, to take it. Compton Mackenzie, who was setting off to England later in June, could take a copy to Secker. After checking that Secker would not want two copies (one for himself and one for *The Century*[86]), Lawrence sent him the autograph manuscript (hereafter MS) via Mackenzie when his typist had finished with it; the ribbon copy typescript (hereafter TS) went to Boston with Francesco Cacopardo, and only the carbon copy typescript (hereafter TCC) was sent back for his own use.

The copy going to America had been meant for Thomas Seltzer. But Lawrence's interest in serialisation was increasing,[87] and he was dissatisfied with Seltzer's failure to fulfil a promise to send the MS of *Women in Love* to Secker. Although Seltzer knew about the Cacopardo plan, Lawrence scribbled an angry and transparently untrue postscript that he refused to 'send any MS. of *The Lost Girl* to America till that is settled about *Women in Love*'.[88] Seltzer cabled Lawrence in July that he would like to publish in early autumn, but his first sight of the book came when Lawrence sent him some of the English proofs at the end of August.

At this point the peculiarity of the book's textual transmission begins to reveal itself. The MS was on its way to London with Mackenzie; the TS was in Boston, Lawrence never having even seen it because Cacopardo had collected it when he passed through Rome. Lawrence's only chance of correcting the text was on the TCC in the first part of June. He wrote to Secker that 'I have the carbon copy, and am correcting it. There is not much to alter. Queer book it is. Being out here, I find it good – a bit wonderful, really... I will send you this carbon copy when you need it. Let me know.'[89] By 17 June, the TCC was 'fully corrected, and with the few alterations in the actual text: only in one place have I made a serious change – about two pages. But that is serious.'[90] That was, in fact, a rather misleading statement: Lawrence clearly did not want Secker to think he had an inferior copy, but his corrections to the TCC were far more extensive than he suggested.

[84] Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 90.
[85] Letter to Mountsier, 12 May 1920.
[86] Letter to Secker, 16 May 1920.
[87] Letter to Mountsier, 7 June 1920.
[88] Letter to Seltzer, 1 June 1920.
[89] Letter to Secker, 12 June 1920.
[90] Letter to Secker, 17 June 1920.